

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

v.

JAMES A. MORGAN,

Defendant.

CRIMINAL ACTION  
NO. 12-23

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this 27th day of July 2018, upon consideration of Defendant's Rule 60(b)(3) Motion to Reopen (Doc. No. 95), Defendant's Motion to Amend His Rule 60(b)(3) Motion (Doc. No. 96), Defendant's Motion for Appointment of Counsel (Doc. No. 97), Defendant's Motion for an Order for the BOP to Turn on His Email (Doc. No. 98), Defendant's Motion for an Order to the Clerk to Send Him Documents for His Rule 60(b)(3) Motion (Doc. No. 99), Defendant's Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis on Rule 60(b)(3) Motion (Doc. No. 100), and Defendant's Application to Appeal in Forma Pauperis (Doc. No. 101), and in accordance with the Opinion of the Court issued this day, it is **ORDERED** as follows:

1. Defendant's Rule 60(b)(3) Motion to Reopen (Doc. No. 95) is **DENIED**.
2. Defendant's Motion to Amend His 60(b)(3) Motion (Doc. No. 96) is **DENIED**.
3. Defendant's Motion for Appointment of Counsel (Doc. No. 97) is **DENIED**.
4. Defendant's Motion for an Order for the BOP to Turn on His Email (Doc. No. 98) is **DENIED**.
5. Defendant's Motion for an Order to the Clerk to Send Him Documents for His Rule 60(b)(3) Motion (Doc. No. 99) is **DENIED**.

6. Defendant's Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis on Rule 60(b)(3) Motion (Doc. No. 100) is **DENIED**.
7. Defendant's Application to Appeal in Forma Pauperis (Doc. No. 101) is **DENIED**.
8. A Certificate of Appealability will not be issued because, for reasons stated in the Opinion filed by the Court on this day, a reasonable jurist could not conclude that the Court is incorrect in denying and dismissing the Rule 60(b)(3) Motion. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473 (2000).

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Joel H. Slomsky  
JOEL H. SLOMSKY, J.